

REMARKS

Within the Office Action of September 27, 2005, Claims 28, 34, 35 and 62 have been rejected, and objection was made to claims 29-33 and 63-67. The rejection was based upon U.S. Patent No 6,757,779 to Nataraj et al.

On November 23, 2005, a phone conference was held between USPTO Examiner Dang T. Nguyen, and Ronald Shea. It was noted that pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action made reference to paragraph numbers that did not correspond to the Nataraj reference.

Upon review of the Nataraj reference, Examiner Nguyen acknowledged the confusion, and requested the Applicant to submit a Response requesting a substitute Office Action with corrections to the cited paragraphs. Examiner agreed that no response to specific issues within the Office Action are necessary in view of the confusion, and further agreed that such a Response would not result in a Final Office Action.

Conclusion

Applicant hereby requests a substitute Office Action with corrected column and line citations corresponding to the cited reference. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Authorization is hereby given to charge deposit account 50-1914 for any fee deficiency associated with this Response.

Respectfully submitted

SHEMWELL MAHAMED I LLP

Dated:

23 November 2005

By:



Ronald R. Shea, Reg. No. 45,098
Tel. 408-236-6638